

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

United States of America,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 07-20167

Thomas Mercer,

Sean F. Cox

United States District Court Judge

Defendant.

/

ORDER DENYING
DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION

On April 29, 2020, Defendant Thomas Mercer filed a motion seeking to reduce the restitution that he owes under his criminal judgment entered in this case. (ECF No. 26). After full briefing by the parties, on September 1, 2020, this Court issued an Order granting that motion – to the extent that the Court reduced the amount of Defendant's restitution obligation from \$331,487.00 to \$326,534.00. (ECF No. 122).

Thereafter, Defendant filed two different motions seeking reconsideration of that order. (ECF Nos. 123 & 124).

Unless the Court orders otherwise, no response to a motion for reconsideration is permitted and no hearing is held. Eastern District of Michigan Local Rule 7.1(h)(3). This Court concludes that, with respect to Defendant's Motions for Reconsideration, neither a response brief nor a hearing is necessary.

Motions for reconsideration are governed by Local Rule 7.1 of the Local Rules of the Eastern District of Michigan, which provides:

(3) Grounds. Generally, and without restricting the court's discretion, the court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication. The movant must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties and other persons entitled to be heard on the motion have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.

See Eastern District of Michigan Local Rule 7.1(h)(3). A motion for reconsideration does not afford a movant an opportunity to present the same issues that have been already ruled on by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication.

After reviewing Defendant's Motions for Reconsideration, this Court concludes that he has not met that standard. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that Defendant's Motions for Reconsideration are **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Sean F. Cox

Sean F. Cox

United States District Judge

Dated: October 2, 2020